

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action dated May 5, 2009. In the Office Action, claims 1-33 were pending and were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1-13, 17, 18, 22, 24, and 26-33 have been amended and claims 14, 23, and 25 have been cancelled. Further, new claims 34 and 35 have been added. In view of the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 102

Claims 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over Metso et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,826 – hereinafter “Metso”).

With this Amendment, independent claim 13 has been amended to recite “a maximum number indication field located within the window” and “wherein the user selects the send button to transmit the body of the message provided in the message field, wherein the computing device concatenates the message into a plurality of message portions based on the maximum number of allowed characters.” As claimed, the plurality of message portions have a consecutive order that is defined based on the body of the message. The computing device transmits each of the plurality of message portions to the mobile device in the consecutive order.

In contrast to amended claim 13, the cited Metso reference discloses a window for composing messages. As disclosed in FIGS. 6-10, and the associated portions of the description, Metso discloses that the user interface window can be used to create and edit messages that are sent to recipients. Column 11, lines 10-14 of Metso mention that a message can have a character limit. In particular, Metso states that an “actual message of up to 160 characters is added to the postcard” (see column 11, lines 13-14). However, this mention of a character limit broadly relates to limiting how many characters can be in a message and has nothing to do with concatenating a message or a plurality of message portions having a consecutive order as claimed. Further, Metso does not teach or suggest that a message can be concatenated into a plurality of message portions that are transmitted to a mobile device in a consecutive order as claimed. Instead, Metso simply states that a message added to a postcard is limited to a

maximum number of characters and does not teach or suggest any concepts related to concatenating a message or transmitting message portions in an order as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference and is an allowable form. Further, Applicant submits that related dependent claims 15-21 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to independent claim 13.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

Claims 1-12 and 22-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Metso in view of Heatley (U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0050096).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “identifying a number of available ports associated with devices for transmitting data between the computing device and the mobile phone”, “generating a list of the available ports”, and “displaying a user interface on a display device of the computing device, the user interface having a user-selectable control including the list of available ports.” As claimed, the user-selectable control enables the user to view the number of available ports. An indication is received from the user of one port of the list of available ports. As claimed, receiving the indication comprises receiving a selection of the one port from the user-selectable control using the computing device. The at least one message is sent to the mobile phone via the one port.

In contrast to independent claim 1, the cited Metso reference discloses a local mobile terminal (i.e. phone 402) that is connected to personal computer 400 using serial link 404. In this manner, Metso discloses communicating between phone 402 and personal computer 400 using serial link 404 and does not teach or suggest a number of available ports associated with devices for transmitting data between a computing device and a mobile phone as claimed. More importantly, nowhere does Metso disclose that the user interface includes a control pertaining to available ports or that a user-selectable control includes a list of available ports where the user can view the number of available ports and select one of the ports from the control.

Further, Applicant notes that Heatley also does not teach or suggest features related to a number of available ports, generating lists of available ports, or displaying a user interface having a user-selectable control including a list of available ports as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and is in allowable form.

Independent claim 22 has been amended to recite “displaying a phone book interface in response to the user selecting the phone book button.” The phone book interface includes an import button. As claimed, a user input is received indicative of selection of the import button and, in response, contacts information is imported from the mobile phone, using the one port, into the at least one row. In contrast, the user interface window of Metso does not include these features. For instance, the phone book window disclosed in FIG. 7 of Metso shows a list of contacts that can be selected by the user. As can clearly be seen in FIG. 7, and the associated portions of the description of Metso, the phone book window does not include an import button for importing contacts. Moreover, Metso does not teach or suggest importing contacts in response to selecting an import button for importing contacts using a port that is indicated as claimed. Heatley also does not teach or suggest features related to importing contacts as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 22 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and is in allowable form.

Further, Applicant submits that related dependent claims 2-12, 24, and 26-35 are also in allowable form at least based on the relation to independent claims 1 and 22, discussed above.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Christopher J. Volkmann/
Christopher J. Volkmann, Reg. No. 60,349
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

CJV/abs